

## REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated March 29, 2004, and has made amendments to the claims. Claims 3, 10, 14 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Amendment to Drawings

The Examiner stated that Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. In response, Figure 1 has been amended to indicate a legend of "Prior Art." A replacement sheet, which includes the change made to the original drawing, is enclosed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added in this amendment and that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0152105 A1 to Arimilli ("Arimilli") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,241 to Koenig et al. ("Koenig et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Arimilli and Koenig et al. references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the invention of claims 1, 5 and 16. Claims 1 and 5, as amended, recite "a local ring generating unit for notifying a connection request signal of the FXO interface to the modem unit from within the interface device...." Original claim 16 recites a method for generating a local ring. As described on page 7, line 7 to line 24 of the specification, the local ring generating unit internally simulates a ring signal, instead of an external ring generating device. Moreover, the interface device relates to one to one communication through an exclusive analog line, and thus does not include an exchange. The local ring generating device, which is included in the interface device, generates a virtual ring alarm signal and transmits the signal to the modem unit, which is also included in the interface device.

In contrast, Arimilli describes a data multiplexing network, wherein, for an FXO interface, a DSP 56002 circuit U14 operates to detect a ring from a PBX (exchange) and returns an off-hook signal to the station side of the PBX (exchange) (see Paragraph 67 and Figure 6C of Arimilli). Thus, unlike the present invention of claims 1, 5 and 16, Arimilli utilizes an exchange (PBX) and does not operate in one to one communication. Also, the ring in Arimilli is generated

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Figure 1. As suggested by the Examiner, Figure 1 has been amended such that it is designated by the legend --Prior Art--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

from an external source, such as the PBX. This is completely unlike the present invention where the ring is internally generated in the interface device.

Koenig et al. describes a line interface unit which converts a T1 digital access line to 12 to 24 individual analog telephone circuits (see Column 16, Lines 27 to 33). Thus, unlike the present invention of claims 1, 5 and 16, Koenig et al. does not suggest an interface device for communicating data using an analog exclusive line.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that combining Arimilli and Koenig et al. do not teach or suggest the claimed invention. In particular, Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest an interface device using an analog exclusive line comprising a local ring generating unit for notifying a connection request signal of the FXO interface to the modem unit from within the interface device. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Arimilli's failure to suggest the non-use of an exchange to facilitate one to one communication of the interface device is evidence that the invention of claims 1, 5 and 16 are not obvious. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claims 1, 5 and 16, and the claims respectively dependent therefrom, be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: March 29, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Lew Edward V. Macapagal

Registration No. 55,416

Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka  
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: 213-623-2221  
Facsimile: 213-623-2211